

**REMARKS**

Applicants are pleased to note that the claims are free of any prior art rejection.

Claim 58 was objected to for being dependent on rejected base claim 57, but otherwise deemed to be allowable (see item no. 7 at the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action).

Claim 57 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in item no. 6 on page 3 of the enclosed Office Action.

The Examiner took the position that the term "injection" in claim 57 is indefinite.

As noted above, claim 58 was deemed to be allowable. Claim 58 recites that the injection is intravenous.

Claim 57 was amended to recite modes of administration that are supported by the paragraph bridging pages 128 and 129 of the specification, namely, intravenous administration, intramuscular administration and subcutaneous administration.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is requested. Allowance is solicited.

An INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT is being filed concomitantly herewith.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. Barth  
Reg. No. 28,180

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.  
220 Fifth Avenue - 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10001-7088  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No. (212) 319-5101  
E-mail Address: BARTH@FHGC-LAW.COM  
RSB/ddf

Enclosure: INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT